

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

INTRINSIC TOPOLOGIES IN A TOPOLOGICAL LATTICE

TAE HO CHOE

INTRINSIC TOPOLOGIES IN A TOPOLOGICAL LATTICE

TAE HO CHOE

It is shown that if (L, T) is a compact connected modular topological lattice of finite dimension under a topology T , then the topology T , the interval topology of L , the complete topology of L , and the order topology of L are all the same.

There are a variety of known ways in which a lattice may be given a topology, e.g., Frink's interval topology [8], Birkhoff's order topology [4], and Insel's complete topology [9].

A lattice L is a *topological lattice* if and only if L is a Hausdorff space in which the two lattice operations are continuous.

In this paper we give some of the relationships between topological lattice and its intrinsic topologies and extend a theorem of Dyer and Shields [7] and a result of Anderson [2]. We shall finally prove the main theorem stated above.

We shall use $A \wedge B$ and $A \vee B$ for a pair of subsets A and B of a lattice L to denote the sets $\{a \wedge b \mid a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\}$ and $\{a \vee b \mid a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\}$, respectively. For a subset A of L , A^* is the closure of A . The empty set is written as \square .

By the *interval topology* of a lattice L , denoted by $I(L)$, we mean the topology defined by taking the closed intervals $\{a \wedge L, a \vee L \mid a \in L\}$ as a sub-base for the closed sets. It is easy to see that if (L, T) is a topological lattice and if $I(L)$ is Hausdorff, then (L, T) is compact if and only if $T = I(L)$ and L is complete.

For a net $\{x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in D\}$ in a complete lattice L , if $\limsup \{x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in D\} = \liminf \{x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in D\} = x$, we say that the net $\{x_\alpha\}$ order converges to x . We define a subset M of a complete lattice L to be *closed* in the *order topology* of L , denoted by $O(L)$, if and only if no net in M converges to a point outside of M .

The following two lemmas are immediate:

LEMMA 1. *If (L, T) is a compact topological lattice, and if $\{x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in D\}$ is a monotone decreasing net in L with $\inf \{x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in D\} = a$, then the net converges to a in T . The dual argument is also true.*

LEMMA 2. *If (L, T) is a compact topological lattice, then $T \subset O(L)$. Moreover, if $O(L)$ is also compact, then $T = O(L)$.*

By a *complete subset* C of a lattice L we shall mean a nonempty subset C of L such that for each nonempty subset S of C , S possesses both a $\sup S$ and an $\inf S$ in L , and furthermore, both $\sup S$ and

$\inf S$ are in C . The smallest topology for L in which the complete subsets of L are closed is called the *complete topology* for L , and denoted by $C(L)$. It is known [9] that $C(L) \subset O(L)$, and if L is complete, then $I(L) \subset C(L)$.

The following lemma follows at once either from Lemmas 1 and 2 or from [11].

LEMMA 3. *If (L, T) is a compact topological lattice, then $I(L)$ is Hausdorff, if and only if $I(L) = C(L) = T = O(L)$.*

The *breadth* of a lattice L is the smallest integer n such that any finite subset F of L has a subset F' of at most n elements such that $\inf F = \inf F'$. It is known [4] that the breadth of L is equal to the breadth of the dual of L .

A subset M of a topological lattice L is *convex* if and only if $(M \wedge L) \cap (M \vee L) = M$ [1]. A topological lattice is *locally convex* if and only if the convex open sets form a basis for the topology. It is well known that a compact (or locally compact and connected) topological lattice is locally convex.

We shall extend a theorem of Dyer and Shields in [7] as follows:

THEOREM 1. *If L is a locally compact, locally convex topological lattice of finite breadth and U is a neighborhood of a point x in L , then there exist two elements y and z in L and a neighborhood V of x such that $V \subset [y, z] \subset U$.*

Proof. Choose neighborhoods U_0, U_1 and U_2 of x such that U_0 and U_2 are convex, U_1^* compact, and $U_0 \subset U_1^* \subset U_2 \subset U$. Again we can choose two neighborhood U_3 and U_4 of x such that $U_3 \wedge \cdots \wedge U_3$ (n times) $\subset U_0$ and $U_4 \vee \cdots \vee U_4$ (n times) $\subset U_0$, where n is the breadth of L . Setting $V = U_3 \cap U_4$ we consider the sublattice W of L generated by V . Since every element w of W can be expressed as a lattice-polynomial of finitely many elements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m of V , we have $\inf x_i \leq w \leq \sup x_i$. Suppose $m > n$. By definition of breadth we can choose at most n elements x'_i from those x_i 's such that $\inf x_i = \inf x'_i$. Thus $\inf x_i \in U_0$. Similarly, $\sup x_i \in U_0$. Clearly $W \subset U_0$ and $W^* \subset U_1^*$. Since W^* is a compact sublattice, W^* has a maximal element z and a minimal element y . Now consider the smallest convex subset $C(W^*) = (W^* \wedge L) \cap (W^* \vee L)$ containing W^* in L (see [1]). It is easy to see that $C(W^*) = [y, z]$. And $V \subset [y, z] \subset U_2 \subset U$. The proof is complete.

Since compactness implies local convexity in a topological lattice, the distributivity hypothesis in Theorem 3 in [7] is not necessary.

It is remarked that the hypothesis of finite breadth in Theorem 1 can be replaced by finite dimension. The author, however, does not know how to obtain this result without using connectedness. For example, the space 2^X (X is an infinite set) has infinite breadth, but has zero dimension. And we note that the 2^X is Hausdorff in its interval topology [10]. (See [4], Problem 81).

A topological lattice is *chain-wise* connected if and only if for each pair of elements x and y with $x \leq y$ there is a closed connected chain from x to y . It is well known [12] that a locally compact connected topological lattice is chain-wise connected.

We shall show that the hypothesis of distributivity in Anderson's result ([2], Corollary 1) can be replaced by modularity. The proof is essentially the same as in [2].

LEMMA 4. *If L is a locally compact connected modular topological lattice, then the breadth of L is less than or equal to the codimension of L .*

Proof. Suppose the codimension of L is n . If the breadth of L is $\not\leq n$, then L contains an $n + 1$ element subset A , say $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$, such that $\inf A \neq \inf B$ for any proper subset B of A . Let $b_i = \inf (A \setminus \{x_i\})$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n + 1$, and let $a = \inf A$. Then $b_i \neq a$, $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$, and $b_i \neq b_j$ ($i \neq j$). Let I_i be the closed interval $[a, b_i]$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n + 1$. Now consider two mappings

$$f: I_1 \times \dots \times I_{n+1} \rightarrow I_1 \vee \dots \vee I_{n+1} \subset L$$

defined by $f(a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) = a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_{n+1}$, and $g: I_1 \vee \dots \vee I_{n+1} \rightarrow I_1 \times \dots \times I_{n+1}$ defined by $g(a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_{n+1}) = (b_1 \wedge (a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_{n+1}), \dots, b_{n+1} \wedge (a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_{n+1}))$. Then clearly f and g are well defined and continuous. Furthermore, $f^{-1} = g$, because by modularity we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &\leq b_1 \wedge (a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_{n+1}) = a_1 \vee (b_1 \wedge (a_2 \vee \dots \vee a_{n+1})) \\ &\leq a_1 \vee (b_1 \wedge (b_2 \vee \dots \vee b_{n+1})) \leq a_1 \vee (b_1 \wedge x_1) = a_1 \vee a = a_1, \end{aligned}$$

and hence $b_1 \wedge (a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_{n+1}) = a_1$, and similarly for $i = 2, \dots, n + 1$.

On the other hand, since such I_i is locally compact and connected in its relative topology, I_i contains a nondegenerate compact connected chain C_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n + 1$. The subset $C_1 \times \dots \times C_{n+1}$ of $I_1 \times \dots \times I_{n+1}$ has codimension $n + 1$ [6]. Hence, the codimension of the closed subset $f(C_1 \times \dots \times C_{n+1})$ of L is $n + 1$. We thus have a contradiction.

LEMMA 5. *If (L, T) is a compact topological lattice of finite breadth, then $I(L)$ is Hausdorff.*

Proof. For two distinct elements x and y of L , choose T -neigh-

neighborhoods U and V of x and y , respectively, such that $U \cap V = \square$. For each element z of $L \setminus \{x, y\}$, choose a T -neighborhood W of z such that $W \cap \{x, y\} = \square$. By Theorem 1, we can find T -neighborhoods U' , V' and W' of x , y and z , respectively, and closed intervals $[x_1, x_2]$, $[y_1, y_2]$ and $[z_1, z_2]$ such that $U' \subset [x_1, x_2] \subset U$, $V' \subset [y_1, y_2] \subset V$ and $W' \subset [z_1, z_2] \subset W$. Clearly the family $\mathscr{W} = \{U', V', W' \mid z \in L \setminus \{x, y\}\}$ is an open covering of L . So there is a finite sub-family of \mathscr{W} which covers L . Therefore, there is a finite family of closed intervals whose union is L such that no interval contains both x and y . It follows by Proposition 1 in [10] that $I(L)$ is Hausdorff.

Summarizing Lemmas 4, 5 and 3, we have the following main theorem:

THEOREM 2. *If (L, T) is a compact, connected, modular topological lattice of finite codimension, then $I(L) = C(L) = T = O(L)$.*

COROLLARY 1. *If (L, T) is a compact topological lattice of finite breadth, then $I(L) = C(L) = T = O(L)$.*

REFERENCES

1. L. W. Anderson, *On one dimension topological lattices*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **10** (1959), 715-720.
2. ———, *On the breadth and codimension of topological lattices*, Pacific J. Math. **9** (1959), 327-333.
3. ———, *On the distributivity and simple connectivity of plane lattices*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **91** (1959), 102-112.
4. G. Birkhoff, *Lattice theory*, Rev. Ed., Amer. Math. Soc. Coll., (1967).
5. T. H. Choe, *On compact topological lattices of finite dimension*, to appear, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.
6. H. Cohen, *A cohomological definition of dimension for locally compact Hausdorff spaces*, Duke Math. J. **21** (1954), 209-224.
7. E. Dyer and A. Shields, *Connectivity of topological lattices*, Pacific J. Math. **9** (1959).
8. O. Frink, *Topology in lattices*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **15** (1942), 569-582.
9. Arnold J. Insel, *A relationship between the complete topology and the order topology of a lattice*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **15** (1964), 849-850.
10. E. S. Northam, *The interval topology of a lattice*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **4** (1953), 824-829.
11. A. J. Ward, *On relations between certain intrinsic topologies in partially ordered sets*, Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. **51** (1955), 254-261.
12. L. W. Ward, Jr. and L. W. Anderson, *A structure theorem for topological lattices*, Proc. Glasgow Math. Assoc. **5** (1961), 1-3.

Received November 3, 1967,

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AND
MCMASTER UNIVERSITY

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

H. ROYDEN
Stanford University
Stanford, California

J. DUGUNDJI
Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. R. PHELPS
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

RICHARD ARENS
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. Yosida

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
* * *
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
CHEVRON RESEARCH CORPORATION
TRW SYSTEMS
NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

Printed in Japan by International Academic Printing Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan

Patrick Robert Ahern, <i>On the geometry of the unit ball in the space of real annihilating measures</i>	1
Kirby Alan Baker, <i>Equational classes of modular lattices</i>	9
E. F. Beckenbach and Gerald Andrew Hutchison, <i>Meromorphic minimal surfaces</i>	17
Tae Ho Choe, <i>Intrinsic topologies in a topological lattice</i>	49
John Bligh Conway, <i>A theorem on sequential convergence of measures and some applications</i>	53
Roger Cuppens, <i>On the decomposition of infinitely divisible probability laws without normal factor</i>	61
Lynn Harry Erbe, <i>Nonoscillatory solutions of second order nonlinear differential equations</i>	77
Burton I. Fein, <i>The Schur index for projective representations of finite groups</i>	87
Stanley P. Gudder, <i>A note on proposition observables</i>	101
Kenneth Kapp, <i>On Croisot's theory of decompositions</i>	105
Robert P. Kaufman, <i>Gap series and an example to Malliavin's theorem</i>	117
E. J. McShane, Robert Breckenridge Warfield, Jr. and V. M. Warfield, <i>Invariant extensions of linear functionals, with applications to measures and stochastic processes</i>	121
Marvin Victor Mielke, <i>Rearrangement of spherical modifications</i>	143
Akio Osada, <i>On unicity of capacity functions</i>	151
Donald Steven Passman, <i>Some $5/2$ transitive permutation groups</i>	157
Harold L. Peterson, Jr., <i>Regular and irregular measures on groups and dyadic spaces</i>	173
Habib Salehi, <i>On interpolation of q-variate stationary stochastic processes</i>	183
Michael Samuel Skaff, <i>Vector valued Orlicz spaces generalized N-functions. I</i>	193
A. J. Ward, <i>On H-equivalence of uniformities. II</i>	207
Thomas Paul Whaley, <i>Algebras satisfying the descending chain condition for subalgebras</i>	217
G. K. White, <i>On subgroups of fixed index</i>	225
Martin Michael Zuckerman, <i>A unifying condition for implications among the axioms of choice for finite sets</i>	233